G. R. S. 58]

Previous references.

1894-5
~~191~~
(Inward)

File No. 17

Serial Nos.

Section I

Later references.
Proc. 182-23-(1-13)

GENERAL AND REVENUE SECRETARIAT.

Serial Nos.

Part B for

SUBJECT.

Passing orders on the management of the Sri Venugopalaswami temple in Srivanga-rajpur Agraharam, T. Narsipur Taluk.

W D 1351—GPB—20,000—13-12-15

1885

From The Dy Commissioner Mysore

To The Secretary to the Dewan of Mysore

Dated 27th October/85

Despd. 28th

Recd -

Encls No: 1

General No 542 / No

Has the honor to forward for orders of the Government copy of the Munsif Officer's letter No 179 dated 29th September 1885 submitting certain proposals regarding the better management of the Venugopalaswamy's temple at Seragarajpur Agrahar in the Turuvekere Taluk.

Dy Commissioner Mysore Dist

MM

A Secretary's outtrep: if any?

Yes

30/85

Sir

F. 17-9

The management of the temple is kept in the hands of S Rackam Ks, person most interested in keeping up the temple & built & endowed by his ancestors, the Munsif & Police interfering the least in the management.

28/11

This order indicated measures is expedient, and the points of minimum interference therein laid down can be adhered to, and so long as the Gejiman conducts himself properly & commands the respect of his neighbours — the Govt. must decline

3/11

Cannot accept
the theory of Vedic
right to manage
set up by the
Gujaman -
The Temple has
always been a
Govt monopoly institution
& must continue to
be so. Govt will
not object to the
Gujaman doing
what Dharma Darsi
do in other Temples,
so long as he
duly performs the
duties entrusted
to him and the
Govt in the Monopoly
Dept is the sole
judge of the
way in which he
performs these
duties.
13/8/94

No 179

Revenue Department
Mysore Dist.

To

The Deputy Commissioner
Mysore District.

Dated Mysore 29th Septr 1805.

Sir,

I have the honor to submit certain proposals which in my opinion are calculated to ensure the better management of the temple of Venu Gopalaswami at Sreerangarajpur of the Srirangadu Nursipore Taluk.

2. This temple was built by Jodidar Sreenivasachar who was also the founder of the Sreerangarajapoora Agraharam. In May 1817, His Highness the Late Maharaja sanctioned the payment of an annual Sasuke of 180 Pagodas for the upkeep of the temple. Sreenivasachar was authorized to receive this money and to spend it in the manner particularized in the Sanad. The Sasuke was some time after considerably reduced. The present allowance

as Rupees 173-15-0 per annum from which have to be met the following charges viz (1) pay of servants (2) their food, (3) Nitya Kaile (daily expenses) and (4) Neelu Kaile (periodical expenses.)

3. Sreenivasachar made a free grant of 9 candies of wet land in favour of the temple. Of these, 2 and odd candies have always been in the Archaks' exclusive possession and enjoyment. At the Inam Settlement this extent was registered in the name of the temple and for the benefit of the Archaks, and may therefore be left out of calculation. Of the remaining 7 candies, 3 are situate under the Raghavapur tank, 3 under the Walkalgere tank, and one under Ramasawmy channel. They are all Eram lands. They present yield as 25 pallas of paddy and Rs 15-8-0 in Cash. Under better management, higher profits may reasonably be hoped for.

4. There was no documentary surrender of these lands to the temple. The lands have not consequently been registered

in

in the name of that institution.

5. Sreenivasachar had the management of the temple in his life time and was succeeded, first by his son and then by one of his grandsons. Brother of his grandsons named Sreenivasa Raghavachar has the nominal Control of the affairs of the institution at present

6. For some time, the whole of the Pastecks was being handed over to the Manager who used to pay the temple servants their respective salaries. With what remained of the Pastecks and with the proceeds of the lands above mentioned, he used to give the temple servants 12½ Seers of rice per month on account of this Padi, besides spending about 37½ Seers of rice and Rs. 2/2 for Nitya Kaile, and larger Sums for Kaichkailes. He was never called upon to render an account of the receipts and expenditure. He used to treat the lands as his own and not as temple property of which he was only the Custodian. As there was no

Journal

formal relinquishment of the Lands Sreenivasachari's heirs have always contended that they are not bound to render an account of the cash items to the Government and that there is nothing to justify them being compelled to spend more than the Jasheth.

5. For many years past, the Archaka has himself been disbursing the pay of the Temple servants, only the padi-kara at Rs. 8-6-8 per Fasli on being handed to the Manager to meet the other charges above adverted to. As those charges greatly exceeded this allowance and as several years ago the Temple fell into disrepair and money had to be laid out on the execution of the needful repairs, the manager offered to give the Temple servants a smaller pad than they were receiving before. There was a complaint on the subject whereupon the Manager came to terms with the servants and got them to put in receipts acknowledging

full

full satisfaction. Having had to spend further sums of money on repairs, the Manager again proposed to Cut down the padi After a lengthy correspondence on the subject, all the servants but one Consented to receive the lower rate of padi for one year. The pariahwanto still holds out and is sending up petition after petition asking for my interference in his behalf.

S. According to the Samaj, the Manager is entitled to much more Consideration than is being shewn to him. His ancestor was the founder of the Agrahara and the builder of the temple. It was he that moved the late Krishnaswami and obtained an order granting an annual basket. He endowed the temple with valuable lands and took a laudable interest in the welfare of the institution. He appointed the temple Servants, disbursed pay and padi to them, and defrayed all other charges including the Cost of repairs. Although old accounts are not forthcoming I think

think he was spending more than the aggre-
gate of Government Taxation and Land Collec-
tions. The Servants were one and all under
his orders and the management was, as far
as I have been able to ascertain, all that
could be desired. Gradually, the manager's
powers and influence were reduced to nothing.
The temple servants now go direct to the
Treasury draw their pay there, and consider
themselves in no way subordinate to the
Manager. The parpakaran makes his
reports direct to the Amildar. The
Servants refuse to obey the Manager. There
is a Court of Appeal to, and interference
by Government officials. In these circumstances
the manager who is almost a monetary
cannot be blamed for declining to
spend more than the paddikara allowance
which is sent to him by the Amildar.
He contends that he has not broken
the Convention over the Lands in question,
and he is not liable to render an
account

account of these gifts, that the repairs of the temple being likely to cost much he cannot give the servants any part out of the produce of the lands and that in a word there is nothing to prevent him from withdrawing his patronage. Be this as it may, it is clear that the affairs of the temple are much neglected. and that both the servants and the manager are discontented and apathetic.

9. In order to mend matters and place the affairs of the temple on a satisfactory footing, I consider the recognition of Srinivasa Raghavachari's claim to the title and powers of gojo was advisable. As a condition precedent to that recognition, I would suggest the following viz (1) He should allocate the lands which his grandfather intended to make a gift of to the temple. He should renounce in writing all claim for himself and for his heirs to those lands &

to

to the Mohtkarpa of a few Rupees sometimes levied from the occupants of houses situate behind the temple. (2) The property should be managed in such manner as may be determined upon by the Managing officer in Consultation with the Gejaman. (3) The probable receipts plus the Costeels should first go to meet the charges indicated in the annexed schedule. The balance if any should be sent to the Treasury to be placed to the Credit of the temple. The Gejaman is at liberty to spend his own money if disposed to Conduct any of the Rables on a larger scale than is provided for. He should not for that purpose take from the temple revenue, more money than is mentioned in the schedule. (4) He should keep the temple in good repair, the said Credit being from time to time drawn upon for the purpose. Whenever a

larger

Larger outlay is required it must come from his own pocket. The insufficiency of the temple fund or the non existence cannot absolve the pujaman from his responsibility to maintain the building in a proper state of repair. (5) He should render an account of receipts and disbursements and should be guided by instructions issued by the Mozrai Department. (6) He should be liable to be removed by Govern: ment for proved misconduct or manifest negligence or incapacity or wilful violation of any of the above Conditions. Subject to these restrictions and safe guards, Irumi: vasa Kayalvaikal may be recog: nized as the pujaman of the temple. The office will remain in his family unless the Government at any time should see cause to direct otherwise.

He will have the management of the affairs of the temple. The temple servants will be under his charge. He will be competent to appoint, dismiss and suspend them subject to confirmation by the Nazzroy officer who will hear appeals and complaints on the subject. He may fine temple servants, grant them leave and make temporary arrangements, viz: forming the Nazzroy Department of the same. The baskets and other collections will be received and spent by him in manner aforesaid, complaints of mismanagement being enquired into by the Nazzroy Department.

10. I have talked the matter over with Sreenivasa Raghavachar and find that he is not disinclined to obtain the restoration of his powers on the terms

I have proposed. The interests of all concerned being likely to be protected by the sufficiently stringent Conditions above laid down and the terms of the Ordinance and Endowment of the Eligible Clergymen entitled to the powers which are recommended to be given them, I request the favour of your sanction my proposal and submitting them for the orders of the Government.

11. In Conclusion I must observe that the scale of trade now proposed is somewhat lower than the scale formerly obtaining. The powers are sufficiently liberal when compared with the trade given in many of the other Provinces where Provisions were in former days much cheaper than now. The quantity which could then have been got for a given sum Cannot now be had for even double that sum, while the original [illegible]

has task remains the same. As a natural consequence, the padi of Mooziary's Servants has every where been greatly reduced. The Servants of this temple cannot therefore have any reasonable cause of Complaint. Then again, in fairness to the Gejaman some saving should be effected, so that the whole burden of the Cost of repairs may not fall on him. Lastly, the Gejaman's assertion that the Servants were daily given liberal rations, not for temple services alone but also for private services which they used to perform in his household, is not altogether without foundation

12 The vernacular file of papers is herewith sent to be obligingly returned when no longer required.

I have the honor to be
Your most obedt Servant
Sd/
Sd. C. Trevenen Walker
Mooziary's office
Ellore 8th April

Copy
Trevenen Walker
Mooziary's Assistant

Schedule

Receipts

Cash	Rice in Seers
Tax & cesses Rs: 173-15-0	
From lands " 15-8-0	From lands 96
Total Rs: 189-7-0	960

Note - Of 25 pallas of paddy 4 per cent for Ratotkawa leaving 21 bullah equivalent to about 96 seers of rice.

Disbursements

Cash	Rice in Seers
(1) Pay and padi of servants — 64-14-0	960
2) Nityakatle - 30-0-0	360
3) Heckkatle for 16 special occasions — 25-0-0	90
Contingencies - 7-9-0	
Total 12 - -	1410

Note. The rice realized from to pay the padi of servants. For the other two items 4½ pallas of rice have to be purchased the rice being about Rs. 35. We shall thus on the disbursement side Rs. 129-0-0 + 35-0-0 or Rs: 164-7-0 and 60 seers of rice.
A saving of Rs: 25-0-0 per annum is expected.

Remarks

Rupees 6 saved by the amalgamation of the of Shanboguve with Parpetegar —

The padi of 960 seers is made up as below:—

Archak at 20 seers a month	240
Parcharak at - do —	240
Parpetagar at 15 - do —	180
Kavalgar at 10 — do —	120
Dhavane and Jagali at 7½ each per month	180
	960

Mysore
30th September 1885.

Copy
Dy Commissioner
Mysore Dist

Sd/ C. Sreenivasaiengar
Inspection Officer
Mysore Dist

(General Serial No. 31.) Draft

188 (3)

From

To The Deputy Commissioner Guyana.

Dated 7/12/55

Despatched

Received 8/7

Enclosures No.

General No. 5044

No. 178

Re No. 5420/27 - Villamor, submitting certain proposals for the better management of Vreed-en-Hoop/Waraka Temple at Leguan, Essequibo Coast.

The memorandum file received with reference to the above, is herewith returned as it is not connected with the Vreed-en-Hoop/Waraka Temple. Request that the correct file may be submitted as early as possible for disposal.

Asst. Secretary

(General Ser'al No. 29)

1885.

GEN 7923 4TH JAN. 86. DEWAN OF MYSORE

From The Dy Commissioner
Mysore District

To Dewan
The Secretary to the ~~Chief Commissioner~~
of Mysore Department.

Dated 21 December 1885.
Despatched 22 do
Received

Enclosures No. 1 Vernacular papers

General No. 658 } 188 —8
No.

His docket No 5049 of 1886 "Instant ament the better management of Venugopalswamy temple at Sreerangaraj pur Agrahar, T. Narsipur Taluk.

With reference to the above, beg to submit the correct file of Vernacular papers as therein called for.

(5)

Read:—

Again Docket No: 5429 27th October 93 - from the Dy: Com[missioner] of Income tax submitting for sanction certain proposals of the Survey Officer regarding the better management of Venugopalaswamy's temple at Sreeranga = = rajpur Agraharam in the Tirumakudlu-Narsipur Taluk.

Docket No: 658 of 21st Dec[embe]r 85 submitting connected records with the above subject.

Order 28/1/86

No 6104 / 229 of 29th-1-86.

The management of the temple is best left in the hands of Srinivasa Raghavachar, the person most interested in keeping

of the temple built and endowed by his ancestors, the Inamdar Officers and Taluk Officials interfering the least in the management.

General Serial No. 31.)

1886

From

To The Dy Comm^r Mysore

Dated 29 January 1886.

Despatched

Received

Enclosures No.

General No. 6104

No. 229

Passing orders adjudicating the better management of the Venugopala Swamy Temple at Srirangapatna Agrahar & Hanasoge Taluk.

K B Lecretary

To The Dy: Com^r Mysore,

Collector & Asst: Sessions Judge

(6)

(General Serial No. 30).

189 / .

From

To The Dy Commr
Mysore Dist

Dated 29th September

Despatched 30th

Received

Enclosures No. one

General No. 7303
M No. 230

Has the honor to
forward herewith
for early report
Petition No. 1078
dated 13th Augt 91
from one Roomba-
bona Lakshmi
Romar Shathachar
residing at Sreeranga-
Rajapur Agrahar
in the Sirama Hudlu
Narsipur Taluk
Complaining of certain
irregularities and
mismanagement in
the temple of

of Sree Venu
Swami in the
said Srirangaraja
puram Agraharam

Boy Andrew

C.J

C.J Under Secy.

OFFICE OF THE
20 AUG 91
DE NAN OF MY

1078
Regd by hand
Rec'd 20-8-91

(General Serial No. 30)

OFFICE OF THE
7858
23 NOV. 91
353.
DEWAN OF MYSORE

1891

From The Deputy Commissioner Mysore District

To The Chief Secretary to the Govt of Mysore

Dated 19th November 1891

Despatched 20th November 1891

Received

Enclosures No. 2

General No. 6754
No.

Petition below
as
25/11/91

Read
24.11.91.

Put before meeting
25/11/91

His docket No. 7507/230 dated 29th September last, forwarding for report petition from Koombhakona Lukshmi-Kumara Bhattachar residing at Sreerangarajapura Agrahara I. Nuggehalli-pur taluk, complaining of certain irregularities in Sree Venu Gopalaswami temple.

In reply has the honor to submit herewith a copy of the Amildar's Officer's docket No. 83 dated — ultimo, from which it will be seen that the temple is in good condition and the worship is regularly performed.

The petition received with the

83
23-11-91

Krishnagar

for Deputy Commissioner.

Mymensingh district.

MM

From

The Muzrai Officer
Mysore District

To

The Deputy Commissioner
Mysore District

Dated October 1891

No. 83

Enclosure No. 1

His Memo No. 1912 dated 4th instant forwarding, in original, Chief Secretary's docket No. 7503/M230 dated 29th September, with an enclosure, calling for a report regarding the irregularities and mismanagement in the temple of Veeraraghavaswamy at Sreerangarajapur Agrahar, T. Narsipur Taluk.

In resubmitting the Docket with its enclosure, received with the above, has the honor to state that the temple gets Rs 173-15-0 from the Government per annum but that the entire management of the temple has been placed in the hands of one Sreenivasa Rajagarachar, Jodidar of Sreerangarajapur Agrahar, and that this office is not interfering unnecessarily with his arrangements, regarding the appointment and dismissal of servants as well as the expenditure of the institution, as per Dewan's Proc. No. 6104/229 dated 29th January 1886

2. The petitioner, Archika of the temple, has absented himself for more than a year and did not appear-

although a notice was given to him by the Amildar of T. Narsipur, at the request of the Managers he was removed and another was nominated by the latter which was duly sanctioned from this office. Now he wants to be reinstated; and an endorsement has been given to him that the appointment has been filled up. The undersigned lately visited some of the temples in that taluk, then no complaints were received against the Jodidar. The Amildar has reported that the temple is in good condition and the worship is properly observed there

(Signed) N. Nanjundaraj Urs
Inspecting Officer

"Copy"

Krishnaiyer
Dy. Deputy Commissioner
Mysore District

ನಂಬರ್ 54

9

ಹುಜೂರು ದಿವಾ ಕಚೇರಿಯಿಂದ.

ಅರ್ಜಿದಾರ ತಿರು ವಲಿ[illegible]ಂಗ್ಲು ನರಶಲುಚೆಟ್ಟಿಲ್ಲೂಕು ಶ್ರೀರಂಗರಾಂಬಪುರ ಅಗ್ರಹಾರದಲ್ಲಿ
ಯಿರುವ ಚಿಲ್ಲರೆ ಡಿಪೋದಾರರಿಗೆ ಶ್ರೀವಾಸರಾಂಪ್ರ ~~ಸೀ ಇಂಡಾರಸ್ಸಹುಕೂ.~~ ನಾಂಚಂಗ್ರಶಗಳ ಇಂಕಾರ್ಸ್ಟ್

ನೀನು ಹುಜೂರಿಗೆ ಗುಜರಾಯಿಸಿದ ನಂ ಡಿಸಂಬರ್ 16 ನೇ ಮಲ್ಕುಮಿನ
ಅರ್ಜಿಯ ~~ಅವರಾಕ್ ಅಂಡೀಕರಿಸಲಕ್ಕದಿಲ್ಲಾ~~ ಪ್ರಸಿಚ್ಚಾರಕ್ಲೆಯಿಂಬರ ಚಿಟ್ಟಿಂದಚುವನ್ನಲ್
ವೈಸ್ಸಗಂರಂಡಿಸ್ಟ್ರಿಕ್ಟ್ಕಳಿ ಮುಖ್ಯಲಿಪಿಯಂಚನರವರಲ್ಲರಳ್ಳುಹಿಸಿಯಿದೆ

ಬತಾರೀಖು 11 ನೇ ಮಾಹೆ ನಂ ಬಿ ಸನ್ 1892 ನೇ ಇಸವಿ ದರಜಾಗಾ,

ಬೆಂಗಳೂರು.

By Order,

Muzrai Secretary.

Draft

ಹುಜುರ್ ದಿವಾಣ ಕಚೇರಿಯಿಂದ

M No 12

(10)

MYSORE DEWAN'S OFFICE,

MUZRAI DEPARTMENT.

OFFICIAL MEMORANDUM.

The accompanying Petition No. 54

dated 16th ultimo received at the

Dewan's Office from Srinivasa Raghavachar

Yeyaman of Sree Venkatopalaswamy

Temple at Sreerangarajapuram

Agraharam Nanjangud Taluk

is forwarded, together with its 12

enclosures, to the Deputy Commissioner

Mysore District for enquiry and

report.

From the enclosures submitted

along with the petition it is

observed that one

Gopala Bhatta a trustee of Sree

Venkatopalaswamy temple has

Contrary orders have been passed

by the Muzrai Officer in regard

to archaka of the Temple

The Deputy Commissioner

is requested to enquire

& report to this office

who is the real and

lawful Archaka and

his opinion on the

same

as early as practicable.

By Order,

Muzrai Secretary.

BANGALORE,

June 189

By Order

A1

Secretary

18/3/92

14

From the Samelu 1284 of 30/4/92

(General Serial No. 1284)

OFFICE OF THE DEWAN OF MYSORE
MUZRAI BRANCH
1284
11

From

The Deputy Commissioner
Mysore District.

To

The ~~Chief~~ Secretary to the Dewan
of Mysore.
Moozrai Department

Dated 30th April

Despatched 17th May 1894

Received 19-5-94

Enclosures No. Petition No. 54 with its 12 enclosures together with the Canarese papers.

General No.
No. 1284

Submitting report on the petition from Srinivasa Raghava Char, Yejaman of Sri Venu Gopala Swami temple at Sreerangapatna for Agraharam, I. Rs. Jalubi.

To the Samskrit 157-89 14/8/94
17-9-94

No. 1284.

En. Petition No, 54 with its 12 Enclosures together with two Canarese papers.

DEPUTY COMMISSIONER'S OFFICE,
MYSORE DISTRICT,

Dated Mysore 30 April 1894.
17 5. 94

From

A Raiagopaum Iyengar Esquire
Deputy Commissioner,
Mysore District.

To

The ~~Chief~~ Secretary to the Dewan of Mysore,

Sir,

With reference to your official memo No 12 dated 14th March 1892 forwarding for enquiry and report petition from Sreenivasa Raghavachar Sejaman of Sree Venugopala Swamy temple at Sreerangarajpur Agraharam, T Narsipoor Taluk, I have the honor to state that both parties had been sent for and necessary enquiries were made. Petitioner represented that the Counter-petitioner (Archak of the temple) had no right to the Archakship, that he had wilfully injured the idol and was otherwise impertinent and disobedient and that the Huzur Department should have no control over the management of the Temple which, under the orders of the Dewan, was made over to the petitioner who was the right party. The petitioner also contended that the

authority of the Petitioner to dismiss the Counter petitioner, that the officer having once approved of the Petitioners' act he was not justified in revising his order, and setting aside the dismissal of the Counter-petitioner and ordering his re-instatement and that the incoming officer should be allowed no interference whatever with his manage-ment of the Temple and that if it could not be done, the Government Dasdik might be resumed and the Temple left to his un-Controlled possession. The Counter petitioner filed document A dated — September 1849 executed by the original Sejaman in favor of Krishnabhatta appointing him as Archik of the Temple allowing him to receive daily 1 Seer of rice and Rupees 2.6 4 per month from Government Dasdik. It is also added in this, that in addition to above emoluments he would be paid daily 1 Seer of rice and Rupees 0-9-4 per month and an Inam wet lands measuring 2 Kandees would be assigned to him. The

counter petitioner also Says that for some years past the Zeyeman of the present manager of the temple had taken back the said Inam land from his possession and has been appropriating its produce to himself.

Prior to 1886, the management of the temple rested with the Muzrai Department, when the same was transfered to the petitioner as per Dewan's Proceedings no $\frac{6104}{229}$ dated 28th January 1886 in which it is stated that the management of the temple is best left in the hands of Sreenivasa Raghavachar, the Muzrai officer and Taluk officials on interfering the least in the management.

Regarding the injury said to have been done by the Archak to the idol in the temple, a lengthy correspondence passed between the Taluk and Muzrai officer of which an English Precis prepared by the Probationery assistant Commissioner is appended to the Vernacular Proceedings. In connection with this matter the Muzrai officer had first thought the archak guilty of deliberately breaking the g

petitioner, but subsequently on the representation of the Archik, he held upon further consideration that there was not sufficient evidence for that opinion and ordered his restoration to the appointment.

I inspected the Agrahar and the temple and made also some informal local enquiries. The Yejaman is a young man, in dispute with all the people living in the Agrahar, owing to his grasping nature, and mischievous proclivities. He does not live in the Agrahar and is not really anxious that the temple should be properly maintained and worship (puja) regularly performed. On the other hand he seems to be anxious rather to spite the agraharies by neglecting the worship in the temple by obstructing pathways, by encroachments upon common lands &c. The archak has been the successor of the original nominee to the office & appears to have enjoyed very liberal allowances. But owing to the rift between Yejaman and the Villagers, the temple servant has

had to ——— suffer from the dis-
pleasure of the yejaman - It is well known that
owing to the very small no available in this
Community for worship in the various temples
of this province and at Kollegal this archek
has occasionally to absent himself from the
temple to attend Rathothsawam &c elsewhere
So long as the yejmon was considerate, he was
able to do so making arrangements for ordinary
puja during his absence - But this is now
rendered impossible by the attitude assumed
by the present yejaman. I know that any
official decision was not likely to adjust
the quarels amicably and wanted to speak
to the young man and bring about a
reconciliation - But I find it a hopeless
task as he has launched into protracted
litigation not only against other Vrattadars
but also against his own agnates - He is
young inexperienced and reckless of his
character and reputation - I think therefore
that there is little chance of making proper
arrangements for worshipping in the temple
unless the Government are disposed to ——

reconsider their ——————— order of
1886 and to introduce the reforms c—
advocated by Mr G. Greenwood Grenger
when merfor officer of this District.

I have the honor to be
Sir
your most obedient Servant.

[signature]
Mr Dr Commissioner
Metropolitan District

(a mpd.
H E

Proceedings of the Government of His Highness the Maharaja of Mysore, (Muzarayi),—dated 14th August 1894.

READ AGAIN —

Government Proceedings No. 6104—229, dated 29th January 1886, observing that the management of the Sri Venugopalaswami temple at Srirangarajpur Agrahar in the Tirumakudlu-Narsipur Taluk, may be left in the hands of Srinivasa Raghavachar, the person most interested in keeping up the temple built and endowed by his ancestor, the Muzarayi Officer and Taluk officials interfering the least in the management.

READ

Petition No. 54, dated 16th February 1892, from Srinivasa Raghavachar, Yejaman of the Sri Venugopalaswami temple at Srirangarajpur Agraharam, Tirumakudlu-Narsipur Taluk, complaining of the interference of the District Muzarayi Officer in the management of the temple contrary to the instructions conveyed in the above order.

READ ALSO —

The following letter No. 1284, dated 30th April 1894 from the Deputy Commissioner, Mysore District, reporting on the above petition of Srinivasa Raghavachar —

With reference to your Official Memo No 12, dated 14th March 1892, forwarding for enquiry and report, petition from Srinivasa Raghavachar, Yejaman of Sri Venugopalaswami temple at Srirangarajpur Agraharam, T. Narsipur Taluk, I have the honor to state that both parties had been sent for and necessary enquiries were made Petitioner represented that the counter-petitioner (Archak of the temple) had no right to the Archakship, that he had wilfully injured the idol and was otherwise impertinent and disobedient, and that the Muzarayi Department should have no control over the management of the temple which, under the orders of the Dewan, was made over to the petitioner who was the right party The petitioner also contended that the Muzarayi Officer was *not justified in enquiring into the authority of the petitioner to dismiss the* counter petitioner, that the officer having once approved of the petitioner's act, he was not justified in revising his order, and setting aside the dismissal of the counter petitioner, and ordering his reinstatement that the Muzarayi Officer should be allowed no interference whatever with his management of the temple, and that if it could not be done, the Government Tasdik might be resumed and the temple left to his uncontrolled possession The counter-petitioner filed document A, dated September 1819, executed by the original Yejaman in favor of Krishna Bhatta appointing him as Archak of the temple allowing him to receive daily one seer of rice and Rs. 2-6-4 per month from Government Tasdik It is also added in this, that in addition to above emoluments, he would be paid daily one seer of rice and Re. 0 9 4 per month, and an Inam wet land measuring two Kandis would be assigned to him The counter-petitioner also said that for some years past the Yejaman or the present Manager of the temple had taken back the said Inam land from his possession and has been appropriating its produce to himself

Prior to 1880, the management of the temple rested with the Muzarayi Department, when the same was transferred to the petitioner as per Dewan's Proceedings No 6104—229, dated 28th January 1886, in which it is stated that the management of the temple is best left in the hands of Srinivasa Raghavachar, the Muzarayi Officer and Taluk officials interfering the least in the management

Regarding the injury said to have been done by the Archak to the idol in the temple, a lengthy correspondence passed between the Taluk and Muzarayi Officer, of which an English Precis prepared by the Probationary Assistant Commissioner is appended to the Vernacular Proceedings In connection with this matter, the Muzarayi Officer had first thought the Archak guilty of deliberately breaking the *Gadayudha*, and approved of his dismissal made by the petitioner, but subsequently on the representation of the Archak he held upon further consideration, that there was not sufficient evidence for that opinion, and ordered his restoration to the appointment.

I inspected the Agrahar and the temple, and made also some informal local enquiries. The Yejaman is a young man, in dispute with all the people living in the Agrahar, owing to his grasping nature and mischievous proclivities. He does not live in the Agrahar, and is not really anxious that the temple should be properly maintained and worship (Puja) regularly performed. On the other hand he seems to be anxious rather to spite the Agraharies by neglecting the worship in the temple, by obstructing pathways, by encroachments upon common lands, &c The Archak has been the successor of the original nominee to the office, and appears to have enjoyed very liberal allowance But owing to the *Zad* between the Yejaman and the villagers, this temple servant has had to suffer from the displeasure of the Yejaman It is well known that owing to the very small number available in this community for worship in the various temples of this Province and at Kollegal, this Archak has occasionally to absent himself from the temple to attend Rathotsavam, &c, elsewhere. So long as the Yejaman was considerate, he was able to do so making arrangements for ordinary Puja during his absence But this is now rendered impossible by the attitude assumed by the present Yejaman I know that any official decision was not likely to adjust the quarrels amicably, and wanted to speak to the young man and bring about a reconciliation But I find it a hopeless task he has launched into protracted litigation not only against other Vrittidars but also against his own agnates He is young, inexperienced, and reckless of his character and reputation I think therefore that there is little chance of making proper arrangements for worship &c in the temple, unless the Government are disposed to reconsider their order of 1886 and to introduce the reforms advocated by Mr C Srinivasaiengar when Muzarayi Officer of this District

1894

GOVERNMENT OF MYSORE

MUZARAYI

PROCEEDINGS.

Dated 14th August 1894

No. 1515
M. F. 1794

Proceedings regarding the management of Sri Venkataramanaswami temple in Sri Venkataramana Agrahara, Tirumakudlu-Narsipur Taluk.

Proceedings of the Government of His Highness the Maharaja of Mysore (Muzarayi),—dated 14th August 1894.

No. 151-8—Muz. F. 17-94, dated, Bangalore, 14th August 1894.

Order thereon.—The Government Order No. 6104—229, dated 29th January 1886, read above, indicated merely what was expedient, and the policy of minimum interference by the District Muzarayi Department therein laid down can be adhered to, only so long as the Yejaman conducts himself properly and commands the respect of his neighbours. The Government cannot accept the theory of exclusive right to manage the temple set up by the Yejaman Srinivasa Raghavachar. The temple has always been a Government Muzarayi Institution and must continue to be so. Government will not object to the *Yejaman* doing what Dharmadarsis do in other temples, so long as he duly performs the duties entrusted to him, and the Government in the Muzarayi Department is the sole judge of the way in which he performs these duties.

Secretary.

To—The Deputy Commissioner, Mysore District, returning the Vernacular Papers.
The Deputy Commissioners of other Districts for information

Exhibits.

GOVERNMENT OF MYSORE

Proceedings of the Government of His Highness the Maharaja of Mysore, (Muzarayi),—dated 14th August 1894.

READ AGAIN:—

Government Proceedings No. 6104—229, dated 29th January 1886, observing that the management of the Sri Venugopalaswami temple at Srirangarajpur Agrahar in the Tirumakudlu-Narsipur Taluk, may be left in the hands of Srinivasa Raghavachar, the person most interested in keeping up the temple built and endowed by his ancestors, the Muzarayi Officer and Taluk officials interfering the least in the management.

READ:—

Petition No. 54, dated 16th February 1892, from Srinivasa Raghavachar, Yejaman of the Sri Venugopalaswami temple at Srirangarajpur Agraharam, Tirumakudlu-Narsipur Taluk, complaining of the interference of the District Muzarayi Officer in the management of the temple contrary to the instructions conveyed in the above order.

READ ALSO:—

The following letter No. 1284, dated 30th April 1894, from the Deputy Commissioner, Mysore District, reporting on the above petition of Srinivasa Raghavachar —

With reference to your Official Memo No 12, dated 14th March 1892, forwarding for enquiry and report, petition from Srinivasa Raghavachar, Yejaman of Sri Venugopalaswami temple at Srirangarajpur Agraharam, T. Narsipur Taluk, I have the honor to state that both parties had been sent for and necessary enquiries were made. Petitioner represented that the counter-petitioner (Archak of the temple) had no right to the Archakship, that he had wilfully injured the idol and was otherwise impertinent and disobedient, and that the Muzarayi Department should have no control over the management of the temple which, under the orders of the Dewan, was made over to the petitioner who was the right party The petitioner also contended that the Muzarayi Officer was not justified in enquiring into the authority of the petitioner to dismiss the counter-petitioner, that the officer having once approved of the petitioner's act, he was not justified in revising his order, and setting aside the dismissal of the counter petitioner, and ordering his re-instatement; that the Muzarayi Officer should be allowed no interference whatever with his management of the temple, and that if it could not be done, the Government Tasdik might be resumed and the temple left to his uncontrolled possession. The counter-petitioner filed document A, dated September 1849, executed by the original Yejaman in favor of Krishna Bhatta appointing him as Archak of the temple, allowing him to receive daily one seer of rice and Rs. 2-6-4 per month from Government Tasdik It is also added in this, that in addition to above emoluments, he would be paid daily one seer of rice and Re. 0-9-4 per month, and in lieu wet land measuring two Kandis would be assigned to him. The counter-petitioner also said that for some years past the Yejaman or the present Manager of the temple had taken back the said Inam land from his possession and has been appropriating its produce to himself.

Prior to 1886, the management of the temple rested with the Muzarayi Department, when the same was transferred to the petitioner as per Dewan's Proceeding, No 6101—229, dated 28th January 1886, in which it is stated that the management of the temple is best left in the hands of Srinivasa Raghavachar, the Muzarayi Officer and Taluk officials interfering the least in the management

Regarding the injury said to have been done by the Archak to the idol in the temple, a lengthy correspondence passed between the Taluk and Muzarayi Officer, of which an English Precis prepared by the Probationary Assistant Commissioner is appended to the Vernacular Proceedings. In connection with this matter, the Muzarayi Officer had first thought the Archak guilty of deliberately breaking the *Gadayudha*, and approved of his dismissal made by the petitioner, but subsequently on the representation of the Archak, he held upon further consideration that there was not sufficient evidence for that opinion, and ordered his restoration to the appointment.

I inspected the Agrahar and the temple, and made also some informal local enquiries. The Yejaman is a young man, in dispute with all the people living in the Agrahar, owing to his grasping nature and mischievous proclivities. He does not live in the Agrahar, and is not really anxious that the temple should be properly maintained and worship (*Puja*) regularly performed. On the other hand he seems to be anxious rather to spite the Agrahars by neglecting the worship in the temple, by obstructing pathways, by encroachments upon common lands, &c. The Archak has been the successor of the original nominee to the office, and appears to have enjoyed very liberal allowance But owing to the *Zal* between the Yejaman and the villagers, this temple servant has had to suffer from the displeasure of the Yejaman It is well known that owing to the very small number available in this community for worship the various temples of this Province and at Kollegal, this Archak has often found it convenient to absent himself from the temple to attend Rathotsavam, &c, elsewhere. So long as the Yejaman was considerate, he was able to do so making arrangements for ordinary Puja during his absence. But this is now rendered impossible by the attitude assumed by the present Yejaman It is clear that any official decision was not likely to adjust the quarrels amicably, and with a view to appeal to the young man and bring about a reconciliation But I find it a hopeless task as he is launched into protracted litigation not only against other Vrittidars but also against his own agnates. He is young, inexperienced, and reckless of his character and reputation I think therefore that there is little chance of making proper arrangements for worshipping in the temple, unless the Government are disposed to reconsider their order of 1886 and to introduce the reforms advocated by Mr C. Srinivasaiengar when Muzarayi Officer of the District

Proceedings of the Government of His Highness the Maharaja of Mysore (Muzarayi),—dated 14th August 1894.

No. 151-8—Muz. F. 17-94, dated, Bangalore, 14th August 1894.

Order thereon.—The Government Order No. 6104—229, dated 29th January 1886, read above, indicated merely what was expedient, and the policy of minimum interference by the District Muzarayi Department therein laid down can be adhered to, only so long as the Yejaman conducts himself properly and commands the respect of his neighbours. The Government cannot accept the theory of exclusive right to manage the temple set up by the Yejaman Srinivasa Raghavachar. The temple has always been a Government Muzarayi Institution and must continue to be so. Government will not object to the *Yejaman* doing what Dharmadarsis do in other temples, so long as he duly performs the duties entrusted to him, and the Government in the Muzarayi Department is the sole judge of the way in which he performs these duties.

A. SREENIVASSACHARLU,
Secretary.

To—The Deputy Commissioner, Mysore District, returning the Vernacular Papers.
The Deputy Commissioners of other Districts for information

No 207 dy 29/30/8/94
Inw 4 17 94
Exd—K. S.

Copy to the Dyleny. Mysore Dt.
with a request that the petr.
Srinivasa Raghavachar may be
informed of the purport of the above
order by an endorsement

By order
A. S.
Secretary

Rcd Aug 29/8/94